

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

will curse us. Let it not be said that because we the legislators have got power now to make laws, we have abused that power. The Government will be pleading off and on that they have no money for development works. Our hon. Finance Minister has been dinning this into our ears.

2-30 P.M.

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA (Sankeswar).—On a point of order Sir, Rule 71 speaks only that members should indicate their opposition to leave being granted. It does not indicate any discussion or debate on the merits of a particular measure. My Hon'ble friend is speaking as if the entire bill is before the House and making reference to many many extraneous matters. The bill is not introduced. It is not before the House. I request a ruling may be given whether this could be done.

MR. SPEAKER.—Shall I give a ruling?

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, before that, I may be heard. My friend Sri Kothavale knows law very well. If I merely say: 'I object, I object', what am I going to object? I remember an incident in this connection. There was a lawyer arguing in a case in a court. He merely said: 'I oppose, I oppose and I oppose'. The Judge asked: 'What are you opposing? You are standing here before me and arguing before me'. So, whenever I oppose, I must adduce reasons for it. I have seen in better places where there are conscientious objections for any measure even at the stage of introduction. After hearing my argument my friend Sri Siddaiah Kasimath may withdraw the Bill. Therefore, I am persuading him with all the humility at my command and with all the vehemence.

MR. SPEAKER.—If members raise points of order, what can I do? I am helpless. I will give my ruling. There is one point on which my discretion is absolutely closed and fettered. If members say: "Sir, you should not reserve the ruling" I will not reserve the ruling.

A point of order has been raised by Hon'ble Member Sri S. D. Kothavale saying that the terms of the rules which permit opposition to the motion before the House indicating introduction or leave to introduce a particular Bill is limited to indicate the point and not *inextenso*, exhaustive arguments or debate as could be made when the Bill is introduced. In fact, he asserts that detailed debate is practically covering the provisions and the particulars embodied in the Bill and it will amount to a debate before its introduction.

The answer furnished by Hon'ble Member Sri Siddaveerappa is a reference to one incident which he had witnessed in some court where the judge was made to hear a lawyer repeating three times 'I oppose, I oppose and I oppose' and asked him something else. It only indicates that mere opposition will not do; the House must apply its mind and find out whether there is any substance in the opposition and the result of the debate may be so good as to persuade the member to withdraw